

**REMARKS**

The present application was filed on October 31, 2003 with claims 1 through 25. Claims 1 through 25 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 18, 19, 21, 22, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Muresan et al. ("Combining Linguistic and Machine Learning Techniques for Email Summarization," Proceedings of CoNLL-2001). The Examiner indicated that claims 3, 6-17, 20, 23, and 24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Independent Claims 1, 18 and 25

Independent claims 1, 18, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Muresan et al. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Muresan discloses determining specificities for the plurality of phrasal expressions (abstract; salient noun phrase extraction; section 2.2; Table 5).

Applicants note that the present specification teaches that

*specificity indicates a partial order among phrasal expressions.* There are different techniques that might be used to determine specificity. For example, *one way to define specificity is to use set inclusion of constituent tokens. For instance, "water" < "water damage," and the order of "water damage" and "tub water" is undefined. Alternatively, the specificity can be defined by an ontological relation such as the "is-a" relation, e.g., "furniture" < "sofa", when an appropriate ontology is available. Method 300 uses set inclusion, but ontological relations may be used in place of or in addition to the set inclusion (Page 9, lines 15-22; emphasis added)*

Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the specificity of a phrasal expression is interpreted as *how "specific" the phrasal expression is*. Muresan does *not* disclose or suggest "determining specificities for a plurality of phrasal expression," as defined in the context of the present invention. Independent claims 1, 18, and 25 require determining specificities for a plurality of phrasal expressions.

Thus, Muresan et al. do not disclose or suggest determining specificities for a plurality of phrasal expressions, as required by independent claims 1, 18, and 25.

Dependent Claims 2-17 and 19-24

Dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 19, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Muresan et al.

Claims 2-17 and 19-24 are dependent on claims 1 and 18, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Muresan et al. because of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 18 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim. The Examiner has already indicated that claims 3,  
5 6-17, 20, 23, and 24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-25, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions  
10 for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: September 11, 2007

Kevin M. Mason  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 36,597  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
1300 Post Road, Suite 205  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 255-6560